

Appl. No. 10/623,240
Amdt. dated December 21, 2005
Reply to Office Action of 11/02/2005

REMARKS

General

Pending in this patent application are Claims 1 and 3-20. Claim 1 and 16 have been amended and Claim 2 has been cancelled without prejudice.

Specification

In the specification, a number of paragraphs were previously amended in an amendment filed on 08/18/2005 to correct minor issues relating to reference numerals. For example, reference numerals were previously amended to properly denote a line (24) and an apparatus (32) of the present invention.

Claims

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1, 3-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Clermont et al (5,828,729) in view of Brockman et al (5,592,530) or Spangler et al (6,327,350).

Currently amended Claim 1 advantageously includes, among other elements, a mass call event detector and a notifier, wherein the mass call event detector and the notifier are a *nominated one of a plurality* of mass call event detectors *and* notifiers, and wherein the one nominated mass call event detector detects the occurrence of the mass call event and the one nominated notifier provides a notification of the occurrence received by each of the network elements. In such a manner, a nominated one of many application processors, which each contain a mass call event detector and a notifier, advantageously detects the occurrence of the mass call event and provides a notification of the occurrence received by each of the network elements. Support for this limitation can be found at least in the paragraph beginning on page 11, line 15 of the pending patent application.

Neither Clermont, Brockman, or Spangler, or a combination of Clermont, Brockman, or Spangler disclose, teach, or suggest such a limitation.

Appl. No. 10/623,240

Amdt. dated December 21, 2005

Reply to Office Action of 11/02/2005

Currently amended Claim 16 advantageously includes, among other elements, permitting a *provisioned* number of calls associated with the mass call event to be processed. Support for this limitation can be found at least in the paragraph beginning on page 14, line 6 of the pending patent application.

Neither Clermont, Brockman, or Spangler, or a combination of Clermont, Brockman, or Spangler disclose, teach, or suggest such a limitation.


Per the aforementioned remarks, Applicants believe currently amended Claims 1 and 16 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request they be passed to allowance. Since Claims 3-15 depend on currently amended Claim 1 which Applicants believe is in condition for allowance, and since Claims 17-20 depend on currently amended Claim 16 which Applicants believe is in condition for allowance, Applicants believe dependent Claims 3-15 and 17-20 are in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1 and 3-20 are in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is therefore requested.

If the Examiner has any other matters which pertain to this Application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned to resolve these matters by Examiner's Amendment where possible.

Respectfully Submitted,


Raffi Gostanian, Jr.
Reg. No. 42,595

Date: 12/21/2005

RG&Associates
1103 Twin Creeks
Allen TX 75013
972.849.1310